

REMARKS

The non-final office action dated December 13, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully noted.

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-17 are rejected by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 11, 15 and 17 are amended.

New claim 18 is added.

Claims 3, 8-10, 12-14 and 16 are cancelled.

The office action summary indicates the Examiner has accepted the drawings and has considered the references identified in the Information Disclosure Statement as evidenced by the Examiner's initials dated December 8, 2006.

Applicant has amended the application as set forth above in an effort to place the application in condition for allowance. No new matter is added by way of the amendment nor are new issues presented for consideration. Applicant respectfully requests such favorable action at an early date in view of the above amendments and following comments on the art of record.

Claim Objections

Claims 8 and 16 are objected to as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Claims 8 and 16 are cancelled as set forth above. Applicant submits the objection is now overcome by virtue of the cancellation of these claims and respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-11 and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Oross et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,826,042.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oross.

Claims 2, 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oross in view the Haywood Patent Publication No. US 2003/0214484.

Applicant submits that Oross does not teach, suggest or disclose a user input device configured for cooperative engagement with a navigational device carried by a portable electronic device and arranged for cooperative movement with the navigational device as a joystick. As disclosed and claimed, Applicant's invention provides greater control of movement of the navigational device in the portable electronic device.

Oross discloses a joystick that is arranged to project above the surface of the device when in use and stowed when not in use. There is no teaching, suggestion or disclosure that the joystick of Oross is arranged for operative movement with a navigational device carried by a portable electronic device for example such as shown and described in connection with Figures 5A and 5B, pages 11-12.


Likewise, Haywood does not teach, suggest or disclose a user input device configured for cooperative engagement with a navigational device carried by a portable electronic device and arranged for cooperative movement with the navigational device as a joystick.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that all the claims of the application are now in condition for allowance and earnestly solicits such action at an early date. The Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney if any questions remain following review of this response.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: June 20, 2007

Jack M. Pasquale  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 31,052

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
Bradford Green, Building Five  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468  
Telephone (203) 261-1234  
Facsimile (203) 261-567